

## DRAFT INDICATORS FOR THE JUSTICE SECTOR

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
<p><b>Independence</b></p> <p>Judicial system (judges and prosecutors) makes decisions without any restriction, improper influence, pressure, threat or fear of interference, direct or indirect, from any authority, including authorities internal to the judiciary</p>	<p><b>1. Judicial independence</b></p>	<p>Measures whether the civil and criminal justice systems are free of improper government or political influence.</p>	<p>Rule of Law Index  <a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a></p> <p>The RoL Index uses two sources of information that are then codified: 1. General Population Poll conducted by leading local polling companies, using a representative sample of 1,0001 respondents in each country; 2. Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires consisting of closed-ended questions completed by practitioners and academics with expertise in civil and commercial law, criminal justice, labour law, and public health.</p>	<p>Composite indicator</p>	<p><b>Baseline (2018):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Civil justice is free of improper government influence <b>score 0.40</b></li> <li>- Criminal justice system is free of improper government influence <b>score 0.39</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 signifies the highest possible score (strong adherence to rule of law) and 0 signifies the lowest possible score (weak adherence to rule of law). 0.40 &amp; below weaker adherence to the rule of law 0.81 &amp; above stronger adherence to the rule of law</p>	<p><b>Baseline (2018):</b>  <u>Civil justice</u> is free of improper government influence score:  <b>Albania: 0.32</b>  <b>Bosnia and H: 0.45</b>  <b>Serbia: 0.34</b>  <b>Montenegro: no data</b>  <b>Turkey: 0.19</b></p> <p><u>Criminal justice</u> system is free of improper government influence score:  <b>Albania: 0.37</b>  <b>Bosnia and H: 0.36</b>  <b>Serbia: 0.23</b>  <b>Montenegro: no data</b>  <b>Turkey: 0.06</b></p> <p><a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a>                      (Select: Indicators 7.4 and 8.6 for each country)</p>

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
		Calculates to what extent is the judiciary independent from influences of members of government, citizens, or private companies	Judicial independence (WEF), Index as part of the <i>Global Competitiveness Index</i>  <a href="http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/03CountryProfiles/WEF_GCI4_2018_Profile_Macedonia_FYR.pdf">http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/03CountryProfiles/WEF_GCI4_2018_Profile_Macedonia_FYR.pdf</a>	Composite indicator	<b>Baseline</b> (2018): value 2.3  <b>Explanation:</b> A scale of 1 (considered among the worst in the world) to 7 (considered among the best in the world) weighted average  <b>NB:</b> the respondents are only from private sector and a very limited number. They respond to one question: to what extent is the judiciary independent from influences of government, citizens and private companies.	<b>Baseline value (2018):</b> <b>Albania: 2.4</b> <b>Bosnia and H: 2.4</b> <b>Serbia: 3.0</b> <b>Montenegro: 3.8</b> <b>Turkey: 2.8</b>  <a href="http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf">http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf</a>
<b>Efficiency</b>  <i>Judicial system makes delivery of quality decisions within a reasonable time following fair consideration of the issues.</i>	<b>2. Clearance Rate<sup>1</sup></b>	Number of resolved cases divided by the number of incoming cases in one-year time <sup>2</sup>	Judicial council reports	%	<b>Numerator:</b> 237,699 <b>Denominator:</b> 237,702  <b>Baseline:</b> (237,699 / 237,702) * 100; <b>99.99 % in 2018</b>  <b>Explanation:</b> A clearance rate above 100 % means that the number of pending cases decreases. A ratio lower than 100% indicates that, during the period considered, the judicial system is unable to process a caseload equal to	<b>NOTE:</b> values are provided for the following sub-categories: civil cases – 1 <sup>st</sup> instance; civil cases – 2 <sup>nd</sup> instance, civil cases – highest instance; criminal cases – 1 <sup>st</sup> instance, criminal cases- 2 <sup>nd</sup> instance, criminal cases – highest instance ( <b>the values are listed in this order for each benchmark countries</b> ):  <b>Baseline (2016):</b>

<sup>1</sup> Clearance rate represents the number of all types of incoming and resolved cases in all courts for 2018

<sup>2</sup> Number of incoming and resolved cases does not include: non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					the number of new proceedings.	<b>Albania: 99 %; n.a; n.a; 100%; 77 %; 101</b> <b>Bosnia&amp;H: 115 %; 95 %; 109 %; 107 %; 98 %; 98 %</b> <b>Serbia: 94 %; 92 %; 84 %; 103 %; 100 %; 96 %</b> <b>Montenegro: 98 %; n.a.; 104 %; 114 %; 104 %; 99 %</b> <b>Turkey: 86 %; 77 %; 69 %; 94 %; 81 %; 103 %</b> Source: CEPEJ report 2018
		Number of resolved cases divided by the number of incoming cases in one-year time <sup>3</sup>	Judicial council reports <a href="http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi/lut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykyssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj08zizdxNTAwsvA183A39LQwcQ_1DzSw93lwsvUz1w8EKDHAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/">http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi/lut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykyssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj08zizdxNTAwsvA183A39LQwcQ_1DzSw93lwsvUz1w8EKDHAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/</a>	%	<b>Numerator:</b> 511,548 <b>Denominator:</b> 503,781  <b>Baseline:</b> (511,548 / 503,781) * 100; <b>101.54 % in 2018</b>	Additionally, to the above list; the values for administrative cases for 2016 are provided below (1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and highest instance):  <b>Albania: 98 %; n.a.; n.a.</b> <b>Bosnia and H: 118 %; 91 %; n.a.;</b> <b>Serbia: 89 %; n.a.; 112 %</b> <b>Montenegro: 88 %; n.a.; 95 %</b> <b>Turkey: 98 %; 23 %; 49 %</b> Source: CEPEJ report 2018

<sup>3</sup> Number of incoming and resolved cases including non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
	3. Disposition Time <sup>4</sup>	Number of pending cases at the end of the observed period divided by the number of resolved cases within the same period multiplied by 365 days <sup>5</sup>	Judicial council reports	Number	<p><b>Numerator:</b> 89,885  <b>Demominator:</b> 237,702  <b>Baseline:</b> (89,885/ 237,702) * 365; <b>138.02 days in 2018</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The indicator determines the number of days necessary for a pending case to be solved in court</p>	<p><b>NOTE:</b> values are provided for the following sub-categories:  civil cases – 1<sup>st</sup> instance; civil cases – 2<sup>nd</sup> instance, civil cases – highest instance; criminal cases – 1<sup>st</sup> instance, criminal cases- 2<sup>nd</sup> instance, criminal cases – highest instance (the values are listed in this order for each benchmark countries):</p> <p><b>Baseline (2016):</b>  <b>Albania:</b> 159; n.a.; n.a.; 108; 413; 253  <b>Bosnia&amp;H:</b> 574; 462; 368; 301; 77; 60  <b>Serbia:</b> 315; 180; 290; 274; 23; 63  <b>Montenegro:</b> 267; n.a.; 35; 145; 7; 26  <b>Turkey:</b> 399; 109; 437; 302; 83; 491</p> <p>Source: CEPEJ report 2018</p>

<sup>4</sup> Disposition time includes all types of incoming and resolved cases in all courts for 2018

<sup>5</sup> Number of resolved and pending cases does not include: non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
		Number of pending cases at the end of the observed period divided by the number of resolved cases within the same period multiplied by 365 days <sup>6</sup>	Judicial council reports <a href="http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj08zizdxNTAwwwA183A39LQwcQ_1DzSw93lwsVUz1w8EKDHAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/">http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj08zizdxNTAwwwA183A39LQwcQ_1DzSw93lwsVUz1w8EKDHAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/</a>	Number	<b>Numerator:</b> 91,608 <b>Denominator:</b> 511,548  <b>Baseline:</b> (91,608 / 511,548) * 365; <b>65.36 days in 2018</b>	Additionally, to the above list; the values for administrative cases for 2016 are provided below (1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and highest instance):  <b>Baseline (2016):</b> <b>Albania: 115; n.a.; n.a.</b> <b>Bosnia&amp;H: 339; 666; n.a.</b> <b>Serbia: 539; n.a.; 65</b> <b>Montenegro: 240; n.a.; 49</b> <b>Turkey: 150; 1203; 907</b>  Source: CEPEJ report 2018
	<b>4. Pending cases<sup>7</sup></b>	Number of cases that remains to be dealt with at the end of the year <sup>8</sup>	Judicial council reports	Number	<b>Baseline:</b> 89,885 cases	<u>NOTE: a different indicator is available:</u> Number of remaining cases at the end of the year <b>per 100 inhabitants</b> (for 1 <sup>st</sup> instance civil and criminal cases; no data about 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> instance cases):  Albania: 0.4; 0.14 Bosnia &H: 7.2; 3.76 Montenegro: 3.4; 2.82 Serbia: 3.4; 5.48

<sup>6</sup> Number of resolved and pending cases including non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

<sup>7</sup> All types of litigation cases in all courts

<sup>8</sup> Number of resolved and pending cases does not include: non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
						Turkey: 2.2; 1.35 Source: CEPEJ report 2018
		Number of cases that remains to be dealt with at the end of the year <sup>9</sup>	Judicial council reports <a href="http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj_o8zizdxNTAwsvA183A39LQw_cQ_1DzSw93lwsvUz1w8EKD_HAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3_NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2_dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/">http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/svi!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAflj_o8zizdxNTAwsvA183A39LQw_cQ_1DzSw93lwsvUz1w8EKD_HAARwP9KGL041EQhd_4cP0ofFZ4ORrjVxAaCIOAx5KC3_NAIq0xPRQAhLkH8/dz/d5/L2_dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/</a>	Number	<b>Baseline: 91,608 cases in 2018</b>	NOTE: a different indicator is available: No of remaining administrative cases at 1 <sup>st</sup> instance at the end of the year (no data for civil and criminal cases; no data for 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> instance administrative cases)  Albania: 3,561 Bosnia &H: 8,094 Montenegro: 2,719 Serbia: 28,161 Turkey: 155,327
<b>Quality</b> <i>Judicial system is provided with conditions/resources to fulfil its mission.</i>	<b>5. Public budget allocated to the Judicial system</b>	Annual Public final budget allocated to the functioning of the judicial system	CEPEJ <a href="https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c">https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c</a>	Number	<b>Baseline: 41,935,302 euro in 2016</b>  Calculation: 29,899,055 (courts) + 11,753,367 (prosecution) + 282,880 (legal aid)  <b>Explanation:</b> the budget includes budget for the Judicial Council, the Council for determining the facts and initiating a procedure for determining responsibility for	<b>Baseline (2016): (courts + prosecution + legal aid = total)</b>  <b>Albania:</b> 15,903,916 + 13,771,074 + 202,096 = <b>29,877,086 EUR</b>  <b>Bosnia&amp;H:</b> 86,590,466 + 25,467,215 + n.a. = <b>112,057,681 EUR</b>

<sup>9</sup> Number of resolved and pending cases including non-litigation cases as well as non-judiciary administrative work of judges

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					a judge, the Academy for Judges and Public Prosecutors and all courts. The budget for prosecution offices includes budget for the Prosecution Council and all prosecution offices, including Specialized prosecution office.	<p><b>Montenegro:</b> 27,664,139 + 8,379,408 + n.a.= <b>36,043,547 EUR</b></p> <p><b>Serbia:</b> n.a. + n.a. + n.a.</p> <p><b>Turkey.</b> n.a. + n.a.a + <b>90,761,996 EUR</b></p> <p>Source: CEPEJ report</p>
	<b>6. Judges and prosecutors</b>	Number of judges/prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants.	<p>Judicial council  <a href="http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/">http://sud.mk/wps/portal/ssrm/sud/izvestai/</a>  Public prosecution office  <a href="http://jorm.gov.mk/?cat=8">http://jorm.gov.mk/?cat=8</a>  SSO Crime statistics  <a href="http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Naselenie_ProcenkiNaselenie/115_Popis_RM_1Star_Dec_eng.px/table/tableViewLayout2/?rxid=46ee0f64-2992-4b45-a2d9-cb4e5f7ec5ef">http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Naselenie_ProcenkiNaselenie/115_Popis_RM_1Star_Dec_eng.px/table/tableViewLayout2/?rxid=46ee0f64-2992-4b45-a2d9-cb4e5f7ec5ef</a></p>	Number	<p><b>Judges:</b>  <b>Numerator:</b> 540  <b>Denominator:</b> 2,075,301  <b>Baseline:</b> (540 /2,075,301) * 100,000; <b>26 judges per 100,000 inhabitants in 2017</b></p> <p><b>Prosecutors:</b>  Numerator: 197  Denominator: 2,075,301  <b>Baseline:</b> (197 /2,075,301) * 100,000; <b>9.54 prosecutors per 100,000 inhabitants</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline (2016):</b></p> <p><b>Judges:</b>  Albania:12.6  Bosnia&amp;H: 28.9  Montenegro: 51.3  Serbia: 38.5  Turkey: 14.1</p> <p><b>Prosecutors:</b>  Albania: 11.2  Bosnia&amp;H: 10.9  Montenegro: 16.6  Serbia: 8.8  Turkey: 6.0</p> <p>Source: CEPEJ report 2018</p>
	<b>7. Staff assigned to judges and prosecutors</b>	Number of staff assigned to judges/prosecutor divided by total number of judges and prosecutors.	<p>CEPEJ  <a href="https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c">https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c</a></p>	Number	<p><b>Staff assigned to judges:</b>  <b>Numerator:</b> 2,225  <b>Denominator:</b> 566  <b>Baseline:</b> (2,225 / 566); <b>3.93 staff per judge in 2016</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline (2016):</b></p> <p><b>Judges:</b>  Albania:2.5  Bosnia&amp;H: 3.1  Montenegro: 3.0  Serbia: 3.5</p>

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					<b>Staff assigned to prosecutors:</b> Numerator: 392 Denominator: 173 <b>Baseline: (392 / 173); 2.26 staff per prosecutor</b>	Turkey: n.a.  <b>Prosecutors:</b> Albania: n.a. Bosnia&H: 1.8 Montenegro: 1.8 Serbia: 2.0 Turkey: n.a.  Source: CEPEJ report 2018
	<b>8. Public budget allocated to legal aid/Judicial system budget</b>	Annual public budget allocated to legal aid divided by the total public budget allocated to the Judicial system.	CEPEJ <a href="https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c">https://rm.coe.int/macedonia/16808d027c</a>	%	<b>Numerator:</b> 282,880 <b>Denominator:</b> 41,935,302  <b>Baseline:</b> (282,880 / 41,935,302) *100; <b>0.67 % in 2016</b>	<b>Baseline (2016):</b> Albania: 0.7 % Turkey: 6.2 % Montenegro: no data Serbia: no data Bosnia &H: no data  Source: CEPEJ report
	<b>9. Success rate of legal aid</b>	Percentage of people receiving free legal aid and convicted against percentage of people assisted by a private lawyer and convicted		%	To be further discussed the availability of data and their collection	no data found
<b>CRIMINAL JUSTICE/PENITENTIARY SYSTEM</b>						
	<b>10. Conviction rate<sup>10</sup></b>	Number of convicted perpetrators divided by the number of accused perpetrators per year.	SSO Crime statistics – special query	%	Baseline: <b>84.50 %</b> for 2017 Explanation: It is necessary to consider all the accused perpetrators in the year X (for instance in 2016) and to see	no data found

<sup>10</sup> The Indicator shows rate only for convicted adult perpetrators



Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					<p>how many of them is convicted in the following years. In order to take into account that trials have different duration, the indicator will have to be corrected on the basis of the percentage of completed trials.</p> <p>For instance: if in 2016 100 persons are accused and by the end of 2017 90 trials are completed with 80 persons convicted and 10 persons acquitted, the conviction rate for 2016 till the end of 2017 is equal to 80/90, i.e. 89% (on a 90% sample). However, in 2018 the number of completed trials might be of 98 with 85 persons convicted and 13 acquitted. The conviction rate for 2016 till the end of 2018 is equal to 85/98, i.e. 87% (on a 98% sample).</p> <p>Alternatively, it can be calculated (in a less accurate way) taking into account the number of accused people in the period X0 – Xn and the number of people convicted</p>	

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					for corruption in the period X1 – X n+1.	
	<b>11. Recidivism rate<sup>11</sup></b>	Number of re-offenders <sup>12</sup> divided by the number of convicted perpetrators.	SSO Crime statistics <a href="http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Sudstvo/425_SK2_ml_T-18_px.px/table/tableViewLayout2/?rxid=46ee0f64-2992-4b45-a2d9-cb4e5f7ec5ef">http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Sudstvo/425_SK2_ml_T-18_px.px/table/tableViewLayout2/?rxid=46ee0f64-2992-4b45-a2d9-cb4e5f7ec5ef</a>	%	It is calculated taking into account the number of convicted people in one year that were already convicted at least once in the past and the total number of convicted people in the same year.  Numerator: 940 Denominator: 6,273 <b>Baseline: (940 / 6,273) *100; 14.98 % in 2017</b>	NOTE: for some countries, with a different methodology, the values are available at Table 2 of the below doc, however it is not comparable because of different methodology  <a href="https://d212y8ha88k086.cloudfront.net/manuscripts/16329/10d76233-0ccb-42bd-8719-d99f89d0000f_14970_-_denis_yukhnenko.pdf?doi=10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.1&amp;numberOfBrowsableCollections=2&amp;numberOfBrowsableInstitutionalCollections=0&amp;numberOfBrowsableGateways=9">https://d212y8ha88k086.cloudfront.net/manuscripts/16329/10d76233-0ccb-42bd-8719-d99f89d0000f_14970_-_denis_yukhnenko.pdf?doi=10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.1&amp;numberOfBrowsableCollections=2&amp;numberOfBrowsableInstitutionalCollections=0&amp;numberOfBrowsableGateways=9</a>
	<b>11 bis. Prison recidivism rate</b>	Number of re-offenders <sup>13</sup> in prisons divided by the number of total inmates in prison.	Administrative statistical data of the of the Administration for the execution of sanctions	%	The indicator Re-offenders Vs Total Convicted is calculated by dividing the number of re-offenders in prison by the total number of convicted in prison. For instance for 2017, it is calculated by dividing the total number of re-offenders in	NOTE: for some countries, with a different methodology, the values are available at Table 2 of the below doc, however it is not comparable because of different methodology

<sup>11</sup> The Indicator shows rate only for convicted adult perpetrators

<sup>12</sup> The number includes all previous convictions for similar and other crimes

<sup>13</sup> The number includes all previous convictions for similar and other crimes

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					prison for the three quarters of 2017 (1,536 + 1,494 + 1,488) by the total number of convicted in prison in the three quarters of 2017 (2,880 + 2,797 + 2,759), i.e. 53%.	<a href="https://d212y8ha88k086.cloudfront.net/manuscripts/16329/10d76233-0ccb-42bd-8719-d99f89d0000f_14970_-_denis_yukhnenko.pdf?doi=10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.1&amp;numberOfBrowsableCollections=2&amp;numberOfBrowsableInstitutionalCollections=0&amp;numberOfBrowsableGateways=9">https://d212y8ha88k086.cloudfront.net/manuscripts/16329/10d76233-0ccb-42bd-8719-d99f89d0000f_14970_-_denis_yukhnenko.pdf?doi=10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.1&amp;numberOfBrowsableCollections=2&amp;numberOfBrowsableInstitutionalCollections=0&amp;numberOfBrowsableGateways=9</a>
	<b>12. Inmates<sup>14</sup> trained rate</b>	Number of inmates attaining training programmes divided by the total number of prisoners.	Administration for the execution of sanctions	%	Numerator: 88 Denominator: 2,677  <b>Baseline: (88 / 2,677) *100; 3.3 % in 2017</b>	no data found
	<b>13. Alternative sanctions rate</b>	Number of convicted perpetrators under alternative measures <sup>15</sup> divided by the number of	SSO Crime statistics <a href="http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Sudstvo/275_SK2_ml-T-13_px.px/?rxid=46ee0f64-">http://makstat.stat.gov.mk/PXWeb/pxweb/en/MakStat/MakStat_Sudstvo/275_SK2_ml-T-13_px.px/?rxid=46ee0f64-</a>	%	Numerator: 3,534 Denominator: 6,273  <b>Baseline: (3,534 /6,273) *100;</b>	no data found

<sup>14</sup> The indicator includes perpetrators in prisons

<sup>15</sup> Alternative measures are used for less grave crimes and when that is not absolutely necessary to sentence the perpetrator includes:

- conditional conviction (sentence shall not be enforced if the convicted within the time period determined by the court, which cannot be less than one or more than five years, does not commit another crime);
- conditional conviction with protective supervision (when it finds that the conditional conviction shall not have sufficient influence upon the offender not to commit new crimes again);
- conditional cessation of the criminal procedure (when law prescribes a fine or an imprisonment sentence of up to one year, and after the consent of the damaged party, provided that the perpetrator will not perform another crime within the time period of the cessation of the procedure);
- community service (when the law prescribes a fine or an imprisonment sentence of up to three years, should the crime be committed under alleviating conditions and the perpetrator has not been previously convicted);
- court reprimand (for crimes for which a sentence imprisonment of up to one year or a fine are prescribed, and which were committed under such alleviating circumstances which make it especially petty, and
- house arrest (if the offender of the crime for which the law prescribes a fine or an imprisonment of up to five years is old and weary, severely ill or pregnant woman, and if the court sentence him/her to imprisonment of up to three years).

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
		total convicted perpetrators.	<a href="https://www.transparency.org/country/MKD">2992-4b45-a2d9-cb4e5f7ec5ef</a>		56.33 % in 2017	
<b>Fight against corruption</b>  <i>The government/administration and businesses, capture, analyse and share data to prevent, detect and deter corrupt behaviour.</i>	<b>14. Fight against corruption</b>	Perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as "capture" of the state by elites and private interests	Corruption perception report <a href="https://www.transparency.org/country/MKD">https://www.transparency.org/country/MKD</a> The 2018 CPI is based on data published in the previous two years and uses 13 data sources from 12 independent institutions specialising in governance and business climate analysis. It includes only sources that provide a score for a set of countries/territories and that measure expert perceptions of corruption in the public sector.	Composite indicator	<b>Baseline:</b> score 37/100 in 2018  <b>Explanation:</b> a score from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean)	<b>Baseline (2018):</b>  Albania: 36 Bosnia&H: 38 Montenegro: 45 Serbia: 39 Turkey: 41  <a href="https://www.transparency.org/country">https://www.transparency.org/country</a>
		Perception of the degree of corruption  The indicator measures whether officials in executive, judicial and legislative branches use public office for private gain	Rule of Law Index <a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a>	Composite indicator	<b>Baseline (2018):</b> score 0.47  <b>Explanation:</b> The scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 signifies the highest possible score (strong adherence to rule of law) and 0 signifies the lowest possible score (weak adherence to rule of law). 0.40 & below weaker adherence to the rule of law 0.81 & above stronger adherence to the rule of law	<b>Baseline (2018):</b>  Albania: 0.35 Bosnia&H: 0.44 Montenegro: no data Serbia: 0.44 Turkey: 0.48  <a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a> (Select: absence of corruption indicator)
	<b>15. Corruption</b>	Number of perpetrators convicted based on	SSO Crime statistics – special query	%	Explanation: It is necessary to consider all the accused perpetrators for corruption in	Baseline (2013): NOTE: data is available for some EU MSs

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
	conviction rate	corruption offences <sup>16</sup> divided by the total number of persons accused on corruption offences			<p>the year X (for instance in 2016) and to see how many of them is convicted in the following years. In order to take into account that trials have different duration, the indicator will have to be corrected on the basis of the percentage of completed trials.</p> <p>For instance: if in 2016 100 persons are accused for corruption and by the end of 2017 90 trials are completed with 80 persons convicted and 10 persons acquitted, the corruption conviction rate for 2016 till the end of 2017 is equal to 80/90, i.e. 89% (on a 90% sample). However in 2018 the number of completed trials might be of 98 with 85 persons convicted and 13 acquitted. The corruption conviction rate for 2016 till the end of 2018 is equal to 85/98, i.e. 87% (on a 98% sample).</p> <p>Alternatively, it can be calculated (in a less accurate way) taking into account the number of accused people</p>	<p>Belgium: 18 / 110 = 0.16            Bulgaria: 99 / 156 = 0.63            Croatia: 65 / 343 = 0.18            Denmark: 2 / 8 = 0.25            Estonia: 29 / 257 = 0.11            Finland: 2 / 46 = 0.04            France: 95 / 331 = 0.28            Hungary: 289 / 2,185 = 0.13            Latvia: 82 / 158 = 0.51            Luxemburg: 5 / 8 = 0.62            Malta: 0 / 8 = 0            Netherland: 11 / 18 = 0.61            Romania: 143 / 1,982 = 0.07            Slovakia: 97 / 110 = 0.88</p> <p><a href="https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetailDoc&amp;id=21215&amp;no=2">https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetailDoc&amp;id=21215&amp;no=2</a> (no database available on Eurostat)</p>

<sup>16</sup> It includes all criminal acts under Chapter 30 "Criminal acts against official duty"

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
					for corruption in the period X0 – Xn and the number of people convicted for corruption in the period X1 – Xn+1.	
Fundamental Rights	16. Violations of Fundamental Rights declared by the ECHR	Execution of Judgements	ECHR To be proposed by the Ministry of Justice	To be proposed by the Ministry of Justice	The indicator will be based on the number of satisfactory and unsatisfactory executions of the Committee of Ministers of the ECHR  23 / 52 = 0.442	<b>Baseline (2018):</b> No of cases closed by final resolution / total pending cases  Albania: 18 / 37 = 0.486  Bosnia&H: 21 / 24 = 0.875  Montenegro: 19 / 14 = 1.35 (2017)  Serbia: 52 / 148 = 0.351 (2017)  Turkey: 372 / 1,237 = 0.3  <a href="https://www.coe.int/en/web/execution/country-factsheets">https://www.coe.int/en/web/execution/country-factsheets</a>
	17. Freedom of expression	Measures whether an independent media, civil society organizations, political parties, and individuals are free to	Rule of Law Index <sup>17</sup> <a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a>	Composite indicator	Baseline: <b>score 0.49</b> in 2018  <u>Explanation:</u> The scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 signifies the highest possible score (strong	Baseline (2018):  Albania: 0.55 Bosnia&H: 0.43 Montenegro: no data Serbia: 0.48

<sup>17</sup> The RoL Index uses two sources of information that are then codified: 1. General Population Poll conducted by leading local polling companies, using a representative sample of 1,0001 respondents in each country; 2. Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires (QRQs) consisting of closed-ended questions completed by practitioners and academics with expertise in civil and commercial law, criminal justice, labour law, and public health.

Strategic goals	Indicator	Definition	Data source	Unit	Remarks	Regional benchmark
	<i>Freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority</i>	report and comment on government policies without fear of retaliation.			adherence to rule of law) and 0 signifies the lowest possible score (weak adherence to rule of law). 0.40 & below weaker adherence to the rule of law 0.81 & above stronger adherence to the rule of law	Turkey: 0.25  <a href="https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019">https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2019</a> (Select: Indicator 4.4 for each country)
		Evaluates in the questionnaire are pluralism, media independence, media environment and self-censorship, legislative framework, transparency, and the quality of the infrastructure that supports the production of news and information.	Reporter without borders Index <a href="https://rsf.org/en/ranking_table">https://rsf.org/en/ranking_table</a>	Composite indicator	<b>Baseline:</b> <b>score 31.66 in 2019</b> <b>score 32.43 in 2018</b> <b>score 35.74 in 2017</b>  <u>Explanation:</u> <b>From 0 to 15 points:</b> Good situation <b>From 15.01 to 25 points:</b> Satisfactory situation <b>From 25.01 to 35 points::</b> Problematic situation <b>From 35.01 to 55 points::</b> Difficult situation <b>From 55.01 to 100 points::</b> Very serious situation  RSF has developed an online questionnaire with 87 questions. Scores are calculated on the basis of the responses of the experts selected by RSF combined with the data on abuses and violence against journalists during the period evaluated.	<b>Baseline (2019):</b>  Albania: 29.84 Bosnia&H: 29.02 Montenegro: 32.74 Serbia: 31.18 Turkey: 50.05  <a href="https://rsf.org/en/ranking_table">https://rsf.org/en/ranking_table</a>

